

October 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13159

But the deeper cause of the gold drain involves the growth rate of the U.S. economy. If the economy hadn't grown so fast in recent years, there probably would have been less price inflation, and the U.S. trade surplus—the excess of exports over imports—would no doubt have held up better, thereby curbing the outflow of dollars and gold. The U.S. trade surplus actually has declined about 5% since 1961. Without a trade surplus to bring some dollars into the country, the flow of U.S. funds abroad to support foreign-aid projects, troops overseas and other foreign programs would reach intolerable proportions, most economists believe.

Perhaps the most lamentable blemish in the boom is the high unemployment rate for teen-age Negroes—25% in 1961 and 25% in boom time 1967. Another dismal statistic: Some 7.8 million Americans are on relief at present, about 600,000 more than in 1961.

THE LONG BOOM PROMPTS ANALYSTS TO ALTER VIEWS

The long business boom has caused some economists to alter their ideas about business growth.

A recent survey of more than 300 members of the National Association of Business Economists found that the group generally believed the country's gross national product would grow at a yearly rate of more than 4% between now and 1975—even after allowing for "growth" due to rising prices. In a similar survey in 1962, the prevailing view was that "real" GNP would grow only about 3% annually over roughly the same period.

Another change: In the 1962 poll, six of every seven economists favored a tax cut to spur business, while now three of four want a tax increase to cool business off a bit.

FEDERAL GRAND JURY INQUIRY INTO THE POLITICAL SPENDING OF LAWRENCE CALLANAN'S STEAMFITTER UNION

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include pertinent material.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, according to an article in the St. Louis, Mo., Globe-Democrat, the Justice Department has sent two of its criminal division attorneys to St. Louis to conduct a Federal grand jury inquiry into the political spending of Lawrence Callanan's Steamfitter Union. This action follows my earlier effort to secure a Federal investigation into alleged violations, by this union, of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. I trust this investigation will be vigorously pursued and under unanimous consent I insert this article, at this point, in the Record:

POLITICAL SPENDING UNDER FIRE: TWO FEDERAL ATTORNEYS HERE FOR STEAMFITTER FUND INQUIRY

The U.S. Justice Department has sent two of its criminal division attorneys to St. Louis to conduct a federal grand jury inquiry into the coast-to-coast political spending of Lawrence Callanan's Steamfitter Union.

This was revealed Tuesday when the two lawyers filed letters of authority with the U.S. District Court clerk here.

The Globe-Democrat disclosed July 21 that the "voluntary political fund" of Steamfitter Local 562 had failed to report to the U.S. on political campaign spending, although it disbursed at least \$80,000 in out-of-state races in the 1964 campaign alone.

Letters of authority of the two special attorneys stated the Justice Department has been informed of violations of "laws relative to political campaign contributions, viola-

tions of the Internal Revenue Code and perjury statutes and other criminal laws . . ."

The violations, according to the letters, are attributed to "persons, companies, firms, associations and organizations to the department unknown."

SPECIFIC TARGET

It was learned that the steamfitter fund, which has been known to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars during a single campaign year, is a specific target of the grand jury inquiry.

As reported last month, the Justice Department informed Rep. Durward G. Hall (Rep.) of Springfield, Mo., that it was investigating "allegations of possible violations" of the federal corrupt practices act by Local 562.

The two special attorneys, who will work with U.S. Attorney Veryl L. Riddle of the Eastern District of Missouri, are Edgar N. Brown and Robert J. Rothal.

NO INDICTMENTS

On Sept. 14 a St. Louis circuit court grand jury concluded an investigation of the steamfitter political fund and returned no indictments. It recommended legislation to tighten the present requirements on reporting of political receipts and expenditures.

The federal law on such reporting applies to any political committee which takes in or spends money in two or more states for political purposes. Maximum penalty for willful violation is two years imprisonment and \$10,000 fine.

NE file GURNEY OPPOSES U.S. AID RESUMPTION TO JORDAN, CITES KING HUSSEIN'S MOSCOW VISIT AND CAIRO PACT

(Mr. GURNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the resumption of American aid to the Kingdom of Jordan. Indeed, I understand that the King will visit Washington shortly to seek additional aid.

Despite King Hussein's trip last week to Moscow, his new agreements with the Kremlin, and his discussion of buying Soviet arms, the American taxpayers are now again subsidizing the Jordanian economy to the tune of at least \$1 million every fortnight. The Washington Post reported on October 8 from Amman, Jordan, that the King, on returning from Moscow, said he would equip his army with arms "from any source."

Hussein has refused to enter peace talks with Israel or to comport himself in conformity with President Johnson's five points on which our Middle Eastern policy rests. Nevertheless, the United States has just presented Jordan with about \$6 million in cash and announced that over \$27 million will be given in the course of this year.

The communique issued in Moscow pertaining to the Hussein visit, Mr. Speaker, spoke of the willingness of the Soviet Union to give the Arabs all support needed to "strengthen their defensive capacity." Hussein made overtures to Moscow that were calculated, at the very minimum, to blackmail the United States into giving Jordan additional aid in the form of arms.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that Hussein was accompanied to Moscow by his army chief of staff, Maj. Gen. Amer Hammash,

and the commander of the Jordanian Air Force, Col. Salah Kurdi. They met with Soviet Defense Minister Grechko. They visited a Soviet Air Force base and a Russian armored unit.

Agreements covering various forms of cooperation were signed in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, are we to subsidize the Jordanian economy so that Hussein can make dollar payments to the Soviet arms industry? Do we encourage Jordan to sign a peace treaty with Israel by ignoring Jordanian intransigence, flirtations with Moscow, and resumption of terrorism against Israel?

King Hussein has not yet abrogated his military pact with Egypt. Since this agreement remains in force, there is really no difference between aid to Jordan or to Egypt. Hussein should sever all military ties with Egypt to qualify for our aid.

King Hussein could have stayed out of the war in June. The Israelis begged him not to join with Egypt and Syria. But he smelled blood, attacked Israel, and now refuses to face the consequences of his aggression. He wrecked his nation and now is acting the role of an innocent victim.

Mr. Speaker, I have written the Secretary of State to say that I oppose all aid in any form to Jordan unless Hussein meets certain preconditions. One prerequisite would be a peace treaty with Israel. Another would be to refrain from entering military supply arrangements with Russia.

Hussein has turned out to be a sort of Moslem Mussolini who is collaborating with Moscow instead of with Hitler as the Italian dictator did.

I have asked the Secretary of State to report on how much we have given or earmarked for Jordan since the end of the war in June. I also asked how this aid was authorized or funded. I feel that the Congress and the American public have a right to know.

INTEGRITY OF CONFIDENTIAL PRESIDENTIAL MEETINGS SHOULD BE PRESERVED

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, from the time of my entry into this great body, I have always thought that one of the essences which we must observe in our contacts with officials of the executive branch has been a sense of courtesy and the preservation of dignity. Certainly, this applies to the Presidency of the United States, whether the President be Republican or Democrat.

The now circulated Republican Congressional Campaign Committee leaflet, a four-page pamphlet, contains what is supposed to be sort of a humorous reference to the President of the United States.

It seems that at one of the recent briefings when the President was bringing in both parties to discuss the serious questions which face us on a fiscal basis, as great men are given to, he made some personal notations on the pad on his

October 10, 1967

desk. Upon the conclusion of the briefing, one of the minority Members, according to the congressional campaign committee leaflet, removed this piece of paper from the desk of the President—not only removed it, but gave it circulation among his colleagues as to what was on this paper. One Member even said, "fit, because his name was inscribed thereon, to place some meaning, especially with regard to him, as to what the President had written on this piece of paper."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that from now on the Members of this congressional body when invited to the home or office of the Chief Executive, will preserve the integrity of his personal paper and not give them out for partisan purposes.

However, I do believe we can draw this meaning from what is being done here, as we attempt to achieve some sort of a bipartisan approach to the obvious difficulties we face in the fiscal area. The President is making more sense with his doodling on a piece of paper than the Republicans are with their needling and diddling. I hope that when they take these pieces of paper from the President's desk they will take them home and think about them, because he is trying to achieve something without this kind of foolish speculation and publication which cannot be associated with good politics.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest we extend to the President of the United States, no matter whether it is the present incumbent or any future President, all the dignity and courtesy which is due to that office, and that does not include sniping and picking up pieces of paper from the President's desk.

RED CHINA LOBBY TRIES A NEW TACK

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have brought to the attention of Members of this body the workings of what is termed "the Red China lobby," or, those persons or groups dedicated to gaining admission of Red China to the United Nations—at any cost.

In 1966, on several occasions, I attempted to counter the spurious "admission" arguments with facts. Two occasions come to mind, namely, my remarks on April 5, 1966, "Red China Lobby at Work Again," and those of June 28, "The Red China Lobby."

Thus it is not without some knowledge of the problem that today I recommend an article by William F. Buckley, Jr., from the Washington Evening Star of October 9, 1967, entitled "Red China Lobby Tries New Tack."

Evidently we are to be asked, again, to involve ourselves in "a devil's bargain." But as Buckley states, it is time for second thought about the ultimate gains of the bargain.

I submit the article for inclusion in the Record:

RED CHINA LOBBY TRIES NEW TACK

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Dr. Walter Judd (is there, by the way, anywhere a more impressive American?) was in

Taipei when the news went out that the United Nations Association of the United States had released a report by a "panel of American businessmen and scholars" urging the recognition of Red China.

Judd was understandably chagrined. He thought, as most people would, that this year above all years the lobby to recognize Red China would take a sabbatical.

After all, U Thant himself, who sometimes talked about the recognition of Red China the way some people talk about achieving the Heavenly Kingdom, is on record as considering the season inappropriate for that kind of action, and for perhaps the first time in a half-dozen years it is generally accepted that the conventional agitation to recognize Red China will be confined to the fever-swamps of the United Nations left, a force about as potent as the movement to impeach Earl Warren.

Judd wondered, as might we all, how come the movement to recognize Red China should have arisen this particular moment. The report of the United Nations Association remarked that this is precisely the right historical moment to recognize Red China, i.e., because Red China is in turmoil. Students of the apologetics for recognition will notice the strangely consistent inconsistencies of the Red China lobby.

Back a few years ago when unquestionably in control of all of China, the argument was that we should recognize the Mao government as the de facto ruler of China with which, like it or not, we would have to deal for generations to come, and wouldn't it be better to introduce Mao's representative into polite society at the United Nations and attempt there to deflect him from his militant stances?

No sooner did this argument become accepted as the staple of the recognition forces than Mao Tse-tung's power over Red China began suddenly to slip, so much so that we had reports from Radio Moscow last week that in the course of attempting to maintain his control, Mao has "suppressed"—a word that is widely regarded by students of Communist euphemism as equivalent to "liquidated"—5-million members of the Communist party. If the figures are anywhere near correct, one can get some idea of the scope of the horror going on in Red China.

To suggest at this moment in world history the advisability of throwing the diplomatic weight of the United Nations and, derivatively, of the United States, toward the stabilization of Mao's regime is, to put it gently, crooked.

But the whole episode was symbolic of the fetishistic attitude of some Americans towards the United Nations. Membership in the United Nations is, as far as some of them are concerned, a baptismal experience—grace instantly follows, and wonderful things lope in over the horizon.

It is this that characterizes the liberals' faith that the United Nations is somehow a civilizing experience. And at this point in history, as Judd unquestionably reasoned, although he had the tact not to reason out loud in Taipei—do we really desire such a tranquilization of Mao's control?

If one were guaranteed that by giving Mao a reassured control of China, one might spare the lives of a great many people, one might acknowledge the temptation to hand China over to him. But second thoughts would surely get in the way of such a devil's bargain.

The World Anti-Communist League is a new organization, whose principal officials—veterans of the anti-Communist struggle in China, Korea, Vietnam, Japan, the Philippines—have much less to learn about how to fight the Communists than they do about how to understand the thinking of the putative anti-Communists who exercise so considerable an influence on Western thought.

ENDURING "SUPPORT OF THIS DECLARATION": WALTER KNOTT'S INDEPENDENCE HALL

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are aware of the Nation's birthplace in Philadelphia's Independence Hall. Fewer people, perhaps, are aware that there is, on the west coast, an exact replica—exact to the most minute detail—of the historic Independence Hall. This building stands on the grounds of Knott's Berry Farm in Buena Park, Calif. It was built by Walter Knott.

Personally, Walter Knott's Independence Hall, and the tour which guides Americans and persons from other nations through it, is even more inspiring, even more likely to well-up the pride of Americans, than the original. For here Walter Knott, an outstanding American, has re-created a part of outstanding America, just as it stands in the original, and added a 14-track stereotape which re-creates the debates of the men who made the choice between liberty and death. The visitor is thus treated to the words which were spoken by men two centuries ago. Lights dim in the chamber and the words of great Americans seem to come from the chairs in which they sat, debate shifting from one part of the room to another as 56 men embarked on the future of all of us.

When asked why he built Independence Hall, Walter Knott replied:

I was asked that same question 25 years ago when we started "Ghost Town." Mrs. Knott and I were 50 years old then; our restaurant business was just getting started and there were so many places on the Farm that needed improvement, yet we felt stirred by the historical past that Ghost Town was to portray, so we let other things wait while we proceeded to build Ghost Town.

Mrs. Knott and I are 75 and we feel this project can be put off no longer, or it might never be done.

Our Declaration of Independence was worked out and signed there by 56 brave men who closed it with these famous words, "And in the support of this declaration, with a reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." Truly great men. Then after nearly ten years of war when victory finally came, other great, and I believe divinely guided, men again met in Independence Hall to decide what kind of government we should have. They too produced one of the world's greatest documents—our Constitution. These two documents are among the greatest ever conceived by man; they have changed the course of liberty.

Independence Hall is a beautiful and state-of-the-art building and one all of us at the Farm will be very proud of. Like the original in Philadelphia, ours too will house a great Liberty Bell, perhaps America's greatest symbol of freedom.

Over the years millions of Americans will visit our Independence Hall and be reminded of our great American heritage. Each year thousands of school children will come and touch the Liberty Bell and see where our great documents were signed, and will view a short motion picture depicting exciting bits of our history.

I think, like starting Ghost Town 25 years ago, building Independence Hall will be a milestone in the history of the Farm and one

October 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H13203

appropriate, proper education, with a good mind and a good body they could build their own steel mills.

We have been trying to concentrate our energies in that direction—in the direction of educating the mind, improving the body and providing food for their sustenance.

When other forms of United States assistance are added to America's program for foreign aid to agriculture, education, and health, namely, our food program, that exceeds some \$3 billion this year. But when it comes to education, every nation—including this one, I think—is still very much a developing country.

We have so much to learn from others. That is one of the primary reasons you are here—to help us sort what there is to do and to make an agenda for it. We firmly believe that the knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when that treasure is shared. So we must find ways to extend the treasure to lands where learning is still the luxury of the few.

One lesson of our experience in economic and social development is quite clear: Education is the greatest single bottleneck. Development means that men and women can put to use in their own societies, in their own lives, in their own time, what modern science and technology can provide to help them. But that requires education.

At the level of basic education the truth of the matter is that we may be falling far behind. It takes so long these days to train a teacher, and yet it is relatively easy to produce a student that we are not even holding our own in basic literacy.

At higher levels of education we are making progress. This year there will be one million young American boys, and girls in the colleges of this country who will be there because of the legislation that we have passed providing for scholarships, grants and loans during the last few years.

But we have only just begun to exploit fully the possibilities that modern technology opens to us.

I can see no reason in the world why modern technology cannot, for example, permit the best professor in the world to teach students all over the world in a field where the vocabulary and the concepts and the standards are uniform; and this is true of many fields, I think—science, natural and social.

Moreover, our capacity to produce microfilm and distribute information should make it possible for a young scholar or researcher at any place in the world to have the same basic library facilities that are available in the British Museum, the Library of Congress, or at one of the great university libraries.

Therefore, I would like to suggest to you this evening some consideration be given to some of these challenges: How can we use what we already know about educational television to accelerate the pace of basic education for all the children of the world? How can we use modern technology to economize on that most essential and that most needed educational resource: The good teacher?

How can we make the good teacher available to the maximum number of students in the world through television?

How can we make the best scholars and teachers in the world available to all universities—wherever they may be—through satellite communications?

So often have I thought of the wonders that could have been brought to those young, struggling minds with warped bodies that I taught back when I was in that little rural school on the United States-Mexican Border if we had had satellite communications, and the best scholars and best teachers had been able to invade those classrooms, to expose those Mexican children to the English language?

How can we use, too, the latest methods of communications and microfilming to provide those who are doing scholarship and research everywhere the best library facilities that are anywhere?

We seem to need more facts. We seem to need to put a program together.

I was quite impressed with a statement in your conference document which said: "If the world's financial systems were forced to function with no better facts than those which educational systems live by, a financial panic would swiftly seize all capitals of the world."

We could have that in the offing anyway.

That is one of the reasons I thought it would be very desirable that we have this conference this year. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction, as Dr. Perkins observed, to know that you have come here upon our invitation, and that you have come here to chart an education strategy for the future.

I should not be presumptuous enough to try to outline that strategy. I content myself with observing a contribution here and there.

If I may suggest another idea, you might consider calling on the United Nations to set a target time for reviewing our goals and planning new progress, and make an international education year for the world.

Don't limit your efforts. Here, and you leave this place, I hope that you will take these plans and really face up to the tough questions:

The real tough question of all is how can we persuade the governments of 131 other nations to make it their primary objective to give every boy and girl born in the world—anywhere—all the education he or she can take?

How can we get the world's leaders to convert man's tragic will to destroy into a determination to build?

How can we shape a world in which men employ their minds in projects of peace—instead of sacrificing their all, their bodies, their lives, on a field of battle?

Can we train a young man's eyes to absorb learning—as eagerly as we train his finger to pull a trigger?

No gathering that has ever assembled has a subject that I think is more urgent than yours—more compelling, more necessary, and more productive.

Here tonight you leaders of educational thought from more than 50 nations—almost half of all the nations of the world—must realize that you are dealing with the dynamite of our times.

Thomas Jefferson said that we should spread the disease of liberty around the world when this Nation was very young. The men of Jefferson's day associated this place where you are meeting tonight with liberty, and also with learning.

Tonight in Williamsburg, I am pleased to observe that you apparently have the same concern. I hope our commitment will be as great as theirs—and I hope that your achievements will be as worthy of remembering.

One more word, if I may be personal.

A President must call upon many persons—some to man the ramparts and to watch the far away, distant posts; others to lead us in science, medicine, education and social progress here at home.

I especially want to comment this great educational leader—Dr. Perkins—for having answered every call that his country has made, and having apparently done it quite well here.

Thank you.

REPORT FROM ISRAEL

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a mission of American Jewish Congress leaders visited Israel this summer to study at firsthand the new political, social, and economic problems facing the country following its lightning military victory over the Arab nations that sought to destroy the Jewish state. The mission met with Government officials, military leaders, refugee spokesmen, and Jews and Arabs from many walks of life. The American Jewish Congress group traveled extensively along the west bank of the Jordan, visited Gaza and El Arish in Sinai, and traveled from Jericho overlooking the Dead Sea as far north as Kuneitra and the Syrian heights.

Their report from Israel follows:

Both the government and the people of Israel seem unable fully to believe that the whole of Eretz Yisrael in its traditional borders from the Jordan to the sea and from the Gaza strip to the Golan heights is now in Jewish hands. The first component of the *matsar ruach*, the general mood that I sensed, was wonder; the second, relief. For the first time in 19 years their lives are not being threatened by Arab marauders and Arab guns. Israel's farms and cities are now out of range of Arab artillery.

The third component is sobriety. There is no air of triumph or arrogance. Israel's citizens are solemnly determined to shoulder the obligations imposed by their military victory. They are cognizant of the overwhelming problems that must be solved; they are equally determined to build a morally responsible plan which will deal with those problems, and they will not be rushed into premature decisions of a long-range nature as they supply the immediate human needs.

Their sobriety is deepened by their losses. In absolute numbers the casualties were small, but in proportion to the population of the State the casualties were heavy—equivalent to some 65,000 American dead in less than a week of fighting. The impact of the war was brought home to us by the many government and other officials we met who had lost sons in the brief campaign.

Everyone we spoke to was deeply sensitive to the need to improve the situation of the displaced Arabs both in Gaza and in the West Bank area. We even met a few high placed officials convinced that Israel should absorb these areas and give their residents full citizenship—even in the face of the strong possibility that the character of the country might be transformed from that of a Jewish state to a bi-national state, with a rapidly-growing Arab population threatening to become the majority within a generation, and with the huge social problems which the introduction of so large a depressed proletariat would entail.

The idea of minority status is unthinkable to most Israelis. All the pain and labor that went into the building of the Jewish state were borne for the purpose of providing some place in the world where Jews would constitute the majority culture group—so that Jewish life, Jewish culture, the Hebrew language, and Judaism itself could flourish. This is the heart of the dilemma. No citizen of Israel wishes to give up what has been painfully achieved; hardly anyone is immune to the influence of Jewish values or free of some degree of commitment to the idea that human beings are of supreme importance.

This does not mean that the army of Israel is made up of angels. It is composed of the entire *kibbutz galuyot*, an ingathering of exiles which includes large numbers who came from Arab lands. I do not doubt, there-

H13204

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 10, 1967

fore, that there were occasional lapses. Arabs in the Gaza strip told us that some Israeli paratroopers had bullied them and "appropriated" watches and the like. Such incidents are not beyond the realm of possibility, but they are certainly atypical if they occurred. More typical were the acts of kindness and concern which Israeli soldiers performed and concerning which we heard unimpeachable testimony. In Hebron, synonym of Arab cruelty since the massacre of the Jews in 1929, not one Arab civilian was killed. In the entire occupied area, there was not one recorded case of rape.

Particularly striking are the natural and friendly relations between Arabs and Jews in the markets, on the streets and in the cafes as they explore each other's sites and cities. We saw Arab families rubbernecking in the New City of Jerusalem and Israelis from Dan to Beersheba taking snapshots and shopping for souvenirs in Arab towns and cities where no Jew had walked for nearly a generation. The fact that sightseeing began so soon after the fighting stopped is an indication of the genuine good will which Israelis bear toward their Arab neighbors . . . and of the readiness of so many Arabs to resume the normal ways of peace. I snapped a picture of a sign on one Arab restaurant in the Old City that read in Hebrew: *m'sadat hashalom biyerushalayim hash'lena*: Peace Restaurant in Reunited Jerusalem.

It quickly became evident that Israel's Arab problem is really three different problems. First there are the approximately 500,000 Jordanians who remain in the Old City of Jerusalem and in the towns and villages along the West Bank of Jerusalem. Here the main concern is economic: how to raise what has always been a depressed area into some form of self-sufficiency.

Then there are an estimated 150,000 who left their homes and fled into Jordan. Some of us in the AJCongress mission saw these people crossing over the Allenby Bridge into Jericho carrying their pots and pans, beds and sofas, clothing and chickens into Jordanian territory. Many thousands have already returned.

Finally, there are those who were dislocated by the way in 1948—an estimated 400,000 persons who remain without permanent homes because the Arab countries in which they found themselves were content to let them remain as "refugees" rather than help them begin life anew as citizens.

By far the most serious aspect of the Arab problem facing Israel is in the Gaza strip, where some 300,000 homeless Arab men, women and children have been fed a diet of hatred and vengeance against Israel since 1948.

In the beach camp for displaced Arabs in Gaza, the coffee we were served and the surface hospitality accorded us did not hide the resentment simmering beneath. Indeed, the twenty-year-old Arab who acted as my interpreter took leave of me after warm handshakes and expressions of friendship with the words, "I hope to see you in Palestine with Ahmed Shukairy!"

Shukairy, demagogic leader of the Palestine Liberation Army, has sworn the destruction of Israel. He has been in complete charge of the training of the former Palestinian Arabs in Gaza since 1948; at Khan Yunis in the lower Gaza strip we saw visual evidence of what that training has been. In a girl's secondary school the walls were covered by an exhibit of paintings by both the instructor and her charges—the bloodiest pictures I have ever seen, not excluding the so-called art of the Nazis. In one, a boot carrying the colors of the Palestine Liberation Army was crushing the chest of an Israeli soldier as gore poured from his prostrate body. In another painting, Arab soldiers were shooting down a large group of opposing soldiers, each of whom wore a huge Star of David. This was the "art work" of children in a school. But

their education was not confined to artistic representation. We also saw the rifle range on which girl students had practised for the invasion of Israel.

Contrast this training with the fact that never since the founding of Israel nearly twenty years ago have Jews been taught to hate Arabs or to covet additional territory. The closest Israel Jews come to irredentism was an abiding love for Jerusalem—a love enshrined in the Psalms, in the poems and songs of ancient and modern Israel, and now in Israel's most popular song: "Jerusalem of gold . . . let me be the harp to sound your songs!"

Compared with the camps in the Gaza strip, the West Bank refugee centers we visited were as day to night. We walked informally into a camp on the road to Nablus and were received with genuine friendliness, curiosity and hopefulness. These were people whose poverty was apparent and among whom the ravages of disease and neglect touched us deeply: a child with a suppurating ear infested with flies, adults whose sight had been impaired or destroyed by trachoma, beggar children looking for coins or bread. These are human needs which demand attention—and everything we were told by members of the Israel government leads us to believe this attention will be quickly given.

It is a task which demands the assistance of all men of good will. It demands resettlement as well as rehabilitation; economic programs as well as medical aid, far beyond the minimal and grudging sustenance that has been given during the last nineteen years. And it requires some form of international support to supplement the programs that Israel is prepared to undertake. We left the camps with the strong impression that the stagnation of 19 years has been ended; that Israel is determined to deal equitably—and effectively—with people who have been used as political pawns for nearly two decades.

"The sword comes into the world," says the Talmud, "when justice is delayed, when justice is perverted and when those responsible for maintaining justice make wrong decisions." Israeli leaders understand how delicately the peace of the world hangs on peace in the Middle East; they recognize that this peace will not be sustained by injustice to the Arabs now living under the Israel flag. The Israelis ask only that the world be patient. Egypt, Jordan and Syria sat on the problem for nearly 20 years and never felt the pressure of civilized opinion for a solution; it hardly seems fair that the world should expect Israel to solve the problem overnight.

The cry over the holy places has the same ring of insincerity. No one complained during the last two decades that the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the Church of the Holy Sepulcher (among others) were under Moslem control. The commercialization and filth that surrounded many of these sites sacred to Christians, and to which we were eyewitnesses, did not testify to a significant measure of Jordanian concern for these places.

As for the sanctity of Jewish holy sites, the Jordanian authorities were completely indifferent. The tomb of Rachel was allowed to decline into a disgraceful condition. Jewish cemeteries on the Mount of Olives were desecrated; the very tombstones were used to build Arab military barracks. In the Old City of Jerusalem we saw pious Jews searching in vain for the locations they remembered as the burial places of their parents and grandparents; we saw synagogues that had been either destroyed or used for secular purposes. Against the Western Wall—the only remnant of the ancient Temple and thus the place most sacred to Jewish memory—the Arabs had permitted the building of a public lavatory.

Yet in our travels throughout Israel and the occupied areas we saw mosque after

mosque—even where there had been bitter fighting—preserved and clean and obviously the objects of public protection. The demands of equity cannot be entirely disregarded by mankind.

The people of Israel are confident of America's friendship, and grateful for the support they have received in the UN from our government. Yet they know—more profoundly than they have ever known—that in the final test they can rely only on themselves and on the ties that bind them to the Jewish people. They are certain, they tell you, that if the Arabs had done what they had planned to do and had knocked out Israel's air force, the United States would have done something. But it would have been too late.

They have little doubt what their fate would have been had the Arab states been able to bomb Tel Aviv and Haifa and send their columns advancing into Israel territory. Friends of mine told me that their womenfolk were preparing to take poison should it become necessary. They were, literally, ready to die to the last man, woman and child. It is understandable that they feel an equally profound satisfaction in the removal of the threat by the seemingly miraculous effectiveness of their own military power. And it is not surprising that they now insist that the Arab nations deal with them directly at the peace table.

"We must stand where we are, have strong nerves and wait for the opportunity to deal with the Arabs directly," we were told. In this they recognize the great problem of Arab shame and humiliation. I believe there is greater understanding of Arab psychology in Israel than any place else in the non-Arab world. After all, almost half the population of the State as it was before June 6 is composed of Jews who were refugees from Arab countries. Perhaps this offers hope for the future.

Meanwhile, Israel is prepared to restore the dignity of those Arabs who have become their wards. Already Arab workers in the Old City are being invited to become members of Histadrut, Israel's labor union movement, where they will earn equal pay for equal work with their Israeli fellow union-members. Already, Israel has reconnected water pipes severed by the Jordanians so that the residents of the Old City of Jerusalem, for example, can enjoy running water seven days a week; before the fighting in June there was water only twice a week. In the Gaza strip, Israel is drawing plans to build up the fishing industry, improve agricultural productivity, provide new jobs with new light industry and engage in a dynamic program of rehabilitation.

The most pointed and intense appeal of Israelis to Western Jews is for an immediate and substantial immigration from the Americas. This sounds like the old, old song, but it has new and vigorous tones. The larger the number of young, educated and committed Jews Israel receives from the West, the more readily Israel can absorb as full citizens the hundreds of thousands of Arabs it has acquired along with the new territory. "Give us 250,000 to 500,000 young Jews from the United States over the next 10 years," we were told, "and we could integrate all the Arabs in the occupied areas, for such an *aliyah* would assure the Jewish character of our country and preserve a Jewish majority for the foreseeable future as the state's existence is made secure."

The Israelis and we agreed above all that this is a time in which Jewish fraternity and solidarity are more necessary than ever. If the vaunted Jewish capacity for creativity and imagination in human relationships really exists, this is when it must be called into action. The situation is not frozen; the main actors must not be inflexible. Plan after plan, bold new idea after bold new idea must be put forward, until the Arabs tire of saying

October 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

"No" and the world unites on redeeming the Middle East for the sake of the redemption of mankind.

MAJOR BENEFITS OF THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the cropland adjustment program established under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 provides many benefits to both farm and nonfarm people. And an indication of the farmer interest in the program is the fact that nearly 75,000 farmers offered about 6 million acres of their land to the program this year. Available funds permitted acceptance of only 2,012,556 acres from 30,810 farmers.

Among those offering land to the program were many older farmers wishing to retire, others growing old and desiring to reduce their farming operations, and still others with new interests, wishing to shift from farming to other endeavors. In the administration of the program, the Department of Agriculture gave preference to these groups, making it possible for some to retire from farming and remain on the land, and for others to take part-time or full-time off-farm jobs.

These new opportunities for farm people through the cropland adjustment program point up the important social and economic implications of this significant activity.

But not only are farmers benefited by CAP, city people as well share in the advantages it provides. Of the 2 million acres accepted into the program this year, about a fourth are open to public access, bringing the total acres under CAP now open to the public to 984,000 acres. This land is open to city folks free of charge for hunting, fishing, trapping, and hiking.

The basic objective of CAP, of course, is to maintain farm income, while shifting land out of crops in plentiful supply and into such conservation uses as open space, recreation, beautification, wildlife habitat, and abatement of air and water pollution.

However, despite the economic and social benefits of this program to both rural and urban people, in the face of a tight budgetary situation, this important activity may be temporarily suspended. But as soon as the situation eases, this program should be resumed to continue improving the quality of our environment while maintaining in reserve the productivity capacity for meeting additional food and fiber needs at home and abroad as these arise.

MASS PRODUCTION OF TAX-DODGING FOUNDATIONS TO BE INVESTIGATED

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Foundations, Select Committee on Small Business, will start hearings on October 30, 1967 to take testimony on the mass production of foundations, an activity that could conceivably wreck the Treasury.

The first witnesses will be trustees and members of a recently discovered organization known as Americans Building Constitutionally—ABC—Barrington, Ill., which allegedly instructs its members in how to avoid taxes by establishing their personal, tax exempt foundations.

Witnesses from Illinois and New York will be heard first, but before we are through, we may have to hear witnesses from many other States. We are not sure how widespread these operations are now, but we do know they could reach epidemic proportions.

Americans Building Constitutionally, for example, pitches its appeal to the upper-middle income group—doctors, lawyers, and other professionals.

Officials of this outfit are quite frank to admit they are attempting to mass produce the tax-dodging specialties that were once associated only with millionaires. It looks like this group has set up a mammoth assembly line for turning out foundations.

If ABC continues to operate, and, if its success is what I think it could be, other groups will undoubtedly go into the same business. Tax-exempt foundations will be as commonplace in this country as bath-tub distilleries were during the prohibition era.

This could be the beginning of complete chaos for the Nation's tax structure.

ABC's tuition for instruction in tax-avoiding techniques comes high, possibly as high as \$14,000 for tutoring in the mechanics of how to set up a foundation.

If ABC's claim of 800 members is correct, then it is entirely possible that the organization had gross receipts of at least \$3 million and perhaps as much as \$8 million in the past year, its first year of operation.

In my opinion, this will be one of our most important studies of tax-exempt foundations because it gets right into the possibility of massive and popular tax-dodging. When millionaires set up tax-dodging foundations, that is bad enough, but when foundations become as common as the model T once was, then the Government's income faces a real and grave peril.

America's political dream used to be a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage. If we ever reach the point where there is a tax-exempt foundation in every home and assets, such as a home and a car, are transferred to that foundation—that will be the beginning of a nightmare for Federal, State, and local governments and their tax collectors.

I must admit that the logic of the ABC system is difficult to dispute. The promoters of ABC take the position that the benefits of tax-dodging—via the foundation gimmick—should not accrue solely to the Rockefellers, the Fords, the Mellons, the Carnegies, and other millionaires. They believe that, even though

that activity has its inception in the salons of financial buccaneers, the ordinary business and professional man should be allowed to do the same thing on a smaller scale.

It is an argument that is hard to answer. If the rich can minimize their taxes with the foundation gimmick, everyone else should have the same privilege. Obviously, there must be a reform of the tax-dodging foundation device from top to bottom.

For 5 years, the Subcommittee on Foundations has been compiling data on foundation activities. The subcommittee was the first to uncover the use of private, tax-exempt foundations by the Central Intelligence Agency. The subcommittee's investigations have also uncovered the widespread use of self-dealing foundations, whereby highly profitable businesses are operating under the guise of charity. Seven of the 600 foundations under study have been assessed about \$28 million in taxes by the Treasury. In all, the subcommittee has issued five studies totaling more than 2,500 pages.

We have focused attention, not only on the abuse of tax laws by individual foundations but also on the lax attitude of the Treasury, whose officials have testified at previous subcommittee hearings that they have no idea how many foundations there are in the country. Treasury officials have also admitted that they audit only a small fraction of the foundations each year.

We shall also take testimony from Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler and Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, in the upcoming hearings. After repeated goadings from our subcommittee, in February 1965 the Treasury finally proposed some foundation reforms to the taxwriting committees. But, even though those watered-down reforms represent only a minimum effort to curb abuses of tax-exempt foundations, the Department has not pushed for action on them. Indeed, over 2½ years have elapsed, and no legislation, in support of those proposals, has as yet been submitted by the Treasury.

The record speaks for itself. The Treasury must bear full responsibility for the proliferation of foundations and their use as a vehicle for abuse of public trust and tax evasion. Unfortunately, it has no more knowledge today of what goes on in the world of foundations than it had at the time of our hearings in 1964.

This continued erosion of our tax base has, of course, far-reaching effects on millions of taxpaying small businessmen who are forced to carry a still heavier tax burden while other Americans enjoy opportunities to reduce taxes. If the Treasury continues to ignore meaningful reforms, we will be faced with a revolt among those millions of taxpayers who are unable to take advantage of such contrivances.

Perhaps this investigation will propel the Treasury into action—for, they may now see the light. They may now see that the tax gimmicks available to the rich can soak down to the grassroots of the Nation and completely erode our tax base. For years, we have been trying to

H 13206

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 10, 1967

persuade the Treasury that the corruptive influences of the multimillion dollar, tax-exempt foundations would eventually destroy the entire tax system. This present situation shows that our warning was no exaggeration.

I am hopeful that the upcoming hearings will prompt Congress to take swift and effective reform action. For, unless the Congress moves in that direction, the spread of foundations and their inherent accommodation to planned deception will create undreamed-of problems that Federal, State, and local governments will find impossible to cope with.

The following are among the witnesses who have, thus far, been asked to testify:

Mr. Robert D. Hayes, trustee, Americans Building Constitutionally, Post Office Box 575, Barrington, Ill.

Mr. James R. Walsh, member, American Building Constitutionally, Post Office Box 575, Barrington, Ill.

Dr. Michael R. Saxon, medical director, the Saxon Foundation, 143 South Lincoln Avenue, Aurora, Ill.

Mr. George Schuyler, president, Philippa Schuyler Memorial Foundation, 11 West 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest has published in its October issue an article by Charles Stevenson which makes an unfair, unsound, and vicious attack on the social security program.

I join with Chairman WILBUR MILLS in saying that the half truths and misrepresentations in the article are a disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries who depend upon the social security program.

I urge that every Member read Chairman MILL's splendid statement and the forceful point-by-point rebuttal of Mr. Stevenson's distorted presentation by the able Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen. Under Secretary Cohen has answered Mr. Stevenson's false charges.

Those who receive social security benefits and those who pay social security taxes should not fear for the soundness or integrity of the social security program. The benefits accruing to beneficiaries are secure and will continue to be so.

For the information of our colleagues and those who read this RECORD, I would like to insert Under Secretary Cohen's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY WILBUR J. COHEN, UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. Charles Stevenson's article on "How Secure is Your Social Security?" in the October issue of the *Reader's Digest* is misleading, and, in my opinion, creates anxiety and fear about the financing of our social security system that are groundless.

I state categorically that:

The social security system is soundly financed.

Present and potential future beneficiaries of social security will get the benefits provided by the social security law.

Mr. Stevenson begins his article by saying our "social security insurance is in trouble." This is not so.

The subtitle of Mr. Stevenson's article says that "Recent disclosures are raising grave doubts as to how much—if anything—today's taxpayer will get back when his time for retirement comes." Use of the words "disclosures," "grave doubts" and "if anything" can only result in worry to millions of people who are now drawing social security benefits or expect to draw them in the future. This worry is wholly without factual basis.

The article seeks to depict Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and the ranking minority member, Representative John W. Byrnes, of the House Committee on Ways and Means as profoundly alarmed about the basic design and fiscal integrity of the social security program and about the course that the program is taking. The facts, however, are that as recently as 5 weeks ago these men jointly supported legislation in the House of Representatives, the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 12080), which builds upon the present social security program and, with careful attention to actuarial soundness, makes needed improvements in the benefits of the program.

The implication that Representative Byrnes, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, agrees with the charges made by Mr. Stevenson flies in the face of the fact that Mr. Byrnes was a co-sponsor of the social security bill now before Congress and is contradicted by his remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives during the debate on the bill. At that time he stated:

"I personally do not feel that the burdens imposed by this bill are greater than the taxpayers will be willing to pay. After all, today's taxpayer is tomorrow's beneficiary. I was very glad to join the chairman of our committee in sponsoring the social security bill—a bill which gives due consideration to the needs of our elderly citizens as well as those who are called upon to pay the taxes."

Representative Byrnes went on to say that: "Everyone paying taxes today can do so with the knowledge that he is participating in a sound program of social insurance which will provide commensurate benefits in the event of his death or disability."

The House Committee report on H.R. 12080, which was signed by 24 out of 25 of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, bears ample witness to the care and thoroughness which the Committee has devoted to assuring the continued soundness of the social security program.

The proposals contained in H.R. 12080 were considered during 18 days of public hearings over a period of 6 weeks, and during 64 executive sessions over a period of 16 weeks. Following debate, the House approved the bill by the overwhelming non-partisan vote of 415 to 3. The bill reaffirms the soundness of the contributory, wage-related social security program.

The soundness of the social security system has been examined a number of times by groups of independent, nongovernmental representatives of business, insurance, labor, and the public.

In 1957, under the Eisenhower Administration, an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing was appointed by Secretary Flemming. It reported as follows:

"The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimate, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provision for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

Among the members of the Council who made this statement were the President of

a Federal Reserve bank, two actuaries—one from a private insurance company and one from a university—and representatives of business, labor and professional groups.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security, again made up of outstanding experts in the field, examined thoroughly all of the issues connected with the "security" of social security. Like the preceding council they concluded, in their report of January 1965, that the social security program is soundly financed and that its income—out into the long range future—will be sufficient to meet its obligations.

Both Advisory Councils took note of such charges as those made in the article to the effect that social security taxes are used for purposes other than social security, that the trust funds contain only IOU's, and that the system is "in the red" by hundreds of billions of dollars. Both Councils found these charges to be without foundation.

II

The article says that the social security program puts a "squeeze on the young." This is not so. The fact is that even without taking into account that social security benefits have been and will continue to be increased from time to time as changes occur in wage levels and cost of living, young workers as a group will get social security protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than they will pay in social security contributions. This is the case under present law and would be the case under the House-passed bill and under the Administration's proposal.

Young workers could not only buy comparable insurance protection from private insurance companies at anywhere near the amount they pay for their social security protection.

The article takes no account of the fact that the benefits provided by the present social security law are very much lower than the benefits that will actually be paid when today's young workers reach retirement age. As wages rise—as they have throughout the history of the country—benefits can be increased *without increasing the contribution rates*. This is because the contributions are a percentage of covered payroll and because, as wages go up, income to the system increases more than the corresponding liabilities.

As a matter of fact, if benefits were not increased as wage levels rise over the years, the contribution rates scheduled in present law would be too high, and they could be reduced. Whether benefits are increased or contribution rates are reduced the result would be the same, namely, more protection in relation to contributions than is shown by analyses that assume no change in wage levels and in benefits.

The calculations referred to in the article assume that the covered employee would have within his control an amount of contributions paid by his employers equal to the amount of his own social security contribution. This assumption rests on a misconception of the nature of the social insurance program and indeed the nature of private group insurance. If such an assumption were used, the whole fabric of private group life insurance, annuity insurance, and other forms of group insurance in this country would have to be regarded as inequitable.

As a general rule, under private group insurance plans the employer contribution is not allocated to each employee in an amount related to the employee's own contribution. On the contrary the employer contribution, as in the case of social security, is what makes it possible to pay larger benefits to workers and their survivors who are in the upper age brackets when the group insurance plan goes into effect than could be paid only on the basis of the worker's own contributions.

I believe it bears repeating that even without taking into account the fact that beneficiaries in future years, even

October 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 4995

greatly expanded job opportunities and the status of the highly educated and highly skilled.

At the same time, it has steadily reduced the number of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, and thus puts the administration in the frustrating position of seemingly withholding the fruits of the great society from the very groups it is intending to benefit most.

More technology or instrumentation or automation means the number of less-skilled jobs steadily shrinks and the number of complex, high-skill, wide-variety, discretionary jobs increases.

We must find a way to make more of our people self-sufficient, producing members of our society.

The poor in the slums, the minority groups in the ghettos, the handicapped, and disadvantaged, the unemployed have to be given opportunities to improve their lot and the motivation to seize those opportunities.

Welfare handouts, meaningless make-work projects, or "shipping them all back to the land of their forebears" are not practical solutions. The history of Greece and Rome is likely to repeat itself here unless we find and make a way to help improve the fortunes of all.

(Bearinger then suggested three areas for study and concern.)

1. First is employment. We must find ways to so organize our needs and our work that the time and effort of our best people is most effectively matched to what truly requires their attention. Every other part must be assigned down the line. At every level, except the very lowest, we already face shortages.

2. Second is the way we regard work. If we are to enjoy further gains of an advancing automation without rioting and looting and sniping in the streets, we have to "sell" jobs.

To try to "give" jobs is economically hazardous and socially unacceptable. Work is "given" to prisoners, to slaves or the otherwise disenfranchised . . . the rebels in our society today cannot be satisfied, and cannot be wholesomely integrated into our way of life by being "given" work any more than by being "given" welfare.

An employment applicant "buys" or declines to "buy" our job, which is pay, benefits, working conditions and most of all, the work itself. The challenge to us is to see that we have work to "sell" to all, not just to the specialists in great demand.

We must apply all the imagination, ingenuity, and sensitivity to our job, meeting the employee's needs and preferences as we have proven ourselves so capable of doing for our product customers.

It is absolutely not a matter of lowering employment standards. It is a matter of designing into our "line" of jobs some that are truly saleable to the dropout, the beatnik, the what-have-you.

The challenge is not that we help him, but that we not deny him the tough, slow, self-disciplining opportunity to help himself.

3. Attitude towards education. Here may be our greatest fault. Those of us in automation certainly ought to know better, yet we, along with most other Americans, are seriously mistaking schooling for education.

The social status symbol of "college" has actually cast a stigma on many needed, important, and worthwhile occupations. Thousands of needed, honest, paying jobs go unfilled; countless thousands more go slackly, slovenly, disgracefully, poorly done because we have downgraded them in our own and everyone's estimation.

Here is the highest challenge of all. The whole, fine, far-out wonderful structure we are straining brain and muscle to create will come crashing down around our ears if we fail to see it in its proper relationship to our entire society.

We are not going to be allowed to have . . . more and better professional people . . . at the expense of a growing body of

uneducated, unemployed, cast-off, disengaged sufferers whose only basic fault is their lack of precise natural talent to fit the narrow, selfish, highly stylized, single-purpose social and economic system we now seem bent upon creating.

The limitation of our future success will not be lack of knowledge, or lack of material resources, nor even lack of professional and managerial talents to enable us, through instrumentation and the other elements of automation, to raise the level of our economy, of our education, our health, our arts, and our reference.

What will limit us—possibly even stop us cold—will be a failure to engage and utilize to the fullest extent of his capability, every responsible citizen of this great nation.

NE file
Former Greek Premier Released From House Arrest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent report that former Premier George Papandreou was about to be released from house arrest after 5 months of confinement should not delude wishful thinkers here that there has been a major change in the political philosophy of the military junta in control in Greece. The announcement, as yet to be confirmed by Mr. Papandreou's actual freedom to come and go at will, and to speak freely, appears to be an attempt to quiet the growing swell of world opinion against the dictatorship.

At the same time this announcement was made, the Greek Minister of Education issued a statement about how education was to be conducted, and that news item gives one cold chills. It reminds one inevitably of the mind-shaping, pattern-molding, educational goals common to Hitlerism and Stalinism.

Andreas Papandreou is still in jail charged with treason on an elaborately constructed web of hearsay. Two of the witnesses against him have already confessed, in this country, that they gave perjured testimony under fear for their lives. Thousands of other citizens are still under arrest in deplorable conditions and others are arrested every day. If you criticize the dictators in any way, you are denounced as a Communist and arrested.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Vlachos, who with great courage has thumbed her nose at the colonels by refusing to publish her newspaper, anticipated her arrest and smuggled out a letter to a European newspaper institute, but addressed to the press of the world. She asks us not to stop attacking the present ruling clique in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, I insert reports of these events, as carried in recent newspapers, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also include a recent letter received by Members of the House from Victor Reuther on behalf of the members of the UAW. His letter expresses the conviction of many of us, and more eloquently than

most of us, the depth of the darkness that has engulfed Greece.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1967]

PUBLISHER: "DON'T STOP"

LONDON, October 8.—Mrs. Helen Vlachos, the defiant Greek newspaper publisher placed under house arrest, was reported here today to be continuing to speak out against the military-dominated regime in Athens.

The Observer published a letter that it said had been smuggled out yesterday by Mrs. Vlachos calling on the world's press to keep on attacking the Government. The letter was said to be addressed to the International Press Institute, a Zurich-based organization of newspaper editors.

According to The Observer, her letter said in part:

"This letter is not dated because it was to be mailed to you by friends living out of Greece in the event that I was stopped from expressing myself freely.

"By it I wish to express my thanks for the warm support and interest the international press of the free world has given to the cause of Greece. And also for the sympathy shown to me personally by friends and colleagues. But the principal reason for it is to ask you to convey a message:

"Don't Stop."

Don't stop writing about Greece, don't stop asking why the Greek Government is not keeping its promises. Officially publicly, repeatedly they have all declared that some kind of press freedom would be restored before the end of the year. And even a pseudo-freedom would help. An arrangement by which the Greek people will not hear all the truth, but at least will not be poisoned and duped by massive daily doses of lies and propaganda."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1967]

ATHENS RELEASES PAPANDREOU, 79—Ex-Premier and eight other political figures freed—Son is still in jail

(By Richard Eder)

ATHENS, October 7.—The Greek military government released from detention today former Premier George Papandreou and eight other political figures.

At the same time, it warned that it was prepared to stamp out any attempts to disturb "the peace and tranquillity of the country."

An announcement by Pavlos Totomis, Minister of Public Order, said that the 79-year-old Mr. Papandreou, who has been isolated under strict house arrest, and eight others, who have been detained either in their homes or in prison, were no longer under restraint.

TWENTY-TWO STILL UNDER DETENTION

Despite the announcement, visitors to Mr. Papandreou's residence tonight were told by the police guard that they had not yet received authorization to allow them to see the former premier, who has been under detention since the April 21 military coup.

The announcement said that "the cases of the remaining 22 politicians now detained would be reconsidered by a security commission."

These presumably included the other non-Communist deputies under arrest, but it was not clear whether the reconsideration would also apply to former Premier Panayotis Canellopoulos, who was ousted by the coup leaders. Mr. Canellopoulos was recently put under house arrest after making a public attack on the regime. Andreas Papandreou, son of the former Premier, is also still under arrest.

"GOVERNMENT IS DETERMINED"

The official announcement of the release of the nine men was followed by a statement by Mr. Totomis saying:

"The Government has exhausted every means of moderation and toleration and has proceeded to a reassessment of the position of political prisoners, confident of offering

A4996

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 10, 1967

a service to the nation, and looking forward to the cooperation of all Greeks with the Government's task."

"The Government is determined to protect through all lawful means the peace and tranquility of the country, and any attempts to disturb order by anyone will be stamped out. The Government has the power and the will to do this."

The wording of the announcement, as well as recent comments in the Government-inspired press, indicated that, with the releases today, the Greek political community, from Mr. Papandreou, is on a strict form of parole.

There was immediate speculation here as to the timing and the reasons for the action.

One line was that the Government was seeking to forestall the issuing of a public manifesto against the regime by a group of political figures. These included members of the Center Union, the main party in Greece, of which Mr. Papandreou is the leader.

Despite the isolation in which Mr. Papandreou has been kept, it was known that he had serious reservations about such a move. His release at this time, therefore, could go a long way to discourage the proponents of such an appeal.

The public attack by Mr. Canellopoulos, party leader of the National Radical Union, has added to the mounting pressure on the regime, and the junta members are believed to be determined to prevent the development of a wave of protest in a country that, up to two weeks ago, was held in strict silence.

The release of the politicians is believed also to be aimed at easing off pressure from abroad, particularly from Western Europe.

In recent weeks the European Economic Community voted to suspend financial credits the Council of Europe has before it a formal complaint from four member Governments asking for the expulsion of Greece unless human rights are restored, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions decided to suspend relations with Greek labor, and the British Labor party urged the expulsion of Greece from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

CRACKDOWN IS FEARED

Some observers, however, expressed fears that the release of the detainees might be something more than a defensive move. They feel that a crackdown on all expressions of political opposition may be in the offing.

Recently, a second special military court for violations of martial law has been set up in Athens, presumably to accommodate an expected rush of business. Sentences for offenders against the martial restrictions have been increased as well.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1967]
GREEK JUNTA EXHORTS TEACHERS TO AROUSE "NATIONAL CONSCIENCE"

ATHENS, October 7.—Teachers were urged by the Government this week to give priority to the stimulation of a "national conscience" among Greek schoolchildren in the new school year.

Education Minister Constantine Kalamobokias, in a message yesterday hailing the reopening of schools, admonished all teachers to "become the guardians of the sacred depository of our national traditions, and guide youth toward the eternal values of our Hellenic-Christian civilization."

The minister's message came as the five-month-old military regime abolished educational reforms introduced in recent years that had shifted that emphasis from the humanities to the sciences.

MORE ELABORATE LANGUAGE

The new educational legislation, which reverted to a large measure to the old system, also abolished "Demotic" (the spoken Greek) from all but the first three grades of elementary school, reintroducing as the official teaching language the "Katharevousa," or the more elaborate "proper" Greek.

Under the new regime, more than 250 teachers whose loyalty was questioned have been dismissed. Seventy dismissals were announced today.

In his message, the minister urged the teachers to remove from children "alien habits and ideas and inculcate in their hearts the fervent desire to emulate the great figures of our nation."

He said: "The first and chief objective of the school is to stimulate the national conscience. To achieve this you need high spirit and exaltation, that will make the school atmosphere vibrate and give that particularly Greek color, which is the foundation of the survival and great deeds of our race."

OBLIGATION TO CHURCH

The message drew attention to the obligation of all teachers and children to attend church on Sundays (except in larger cities where they should pray on Saturday to avoid crowding the churches), and go to confession and Holy Communion regularly.

The established religion in Greece is that of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Teachers were urged to dress and behave with dignity to set a good example, while their "vigilance and surveillance" of pupils should also extend beyond the school.

"It would be ideal," Mr. Kalamobokias went on, "if pupils could remain under the influence of the school all day, by organizing them inside the school after class." This would involve the creation of libraries, reading rooms and sports grounds which are lacking.

He said teachers should also give, individually or through lectures, guidance to parents for the better upbringing of their children, "emphasizing the value of developing their religious, national and moral convictions."

The minister's message concluded: "The influence of educators cannot possibly be limited to pupils and, to some extent, their parents, their activity must extend to their extraschool occupations, thus contributing to the promotion of the community in which they live. For this season they cannot be absent from their posts, barring exceptional circumstances, and only following authorization from their superior authority."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1967]

GREECE: JUNTA IN SEARCH OF A CAUSE

(By Richard Eder)

ATHENS.—Last Monday night, former Prime Minister Panayotis Kanellopoulos was chatting with a visitor in his apartment when the doorbell rang and two men entered.

They identified themselves as agents from the security police and told Mr. Kanellopoulos who, the previous week, had delivered a stinging attack upon the military junta, that he was under house arrest. Nobody could enter or leave except his wife and the maid.

The visitor broke in to say that he would like to go home. The policeman replied that orders were orders, but finally they agreed to telephone their superiors. Mr. Kanellopoulos offered them his telephone.

"I'm afraid we can't use it, sir," the policeman said. "You see, we've cut it off." They nevertheless did release the visitor.

Finally, a telephone was located in a nearby store and permission was secured for the visitor to leave.

It is nearly six months since a group of officers led part of the Greek Army in a coup against the quarrelling and ineffective political parties that were governing the country. They intended, they said, to quell the Communist, prune the bureaucracy, reshape the parties and, in short, mobilize the constructive forces of Greece so that when democracy was restored it would work.

DEAD INSTRUMENT

Having cut the wires, so to speak, the junta leaders find themselves, like the plainclothesmen, holding a dead instrument. After

six months in office, perhaps the most important thing about the new leaders is that they have established no real links with the community they are to reform.

"How can you call this a dictatorship?" a Government spokesman said not long ago. "It has no leader, no party and no theory."

This is precisely the point. After six months, the junta remains almost as unknown in its intentions, its capacities and its structure as on the first day. Greeks have no measure by which to judge it. There are three questions that any group that seizes power by force of arms is expected to answer: Who are you? What do you intend to do? And finally, how long are you staying?

The answer to the first is unclear. Col. George Papadopoulos is obviously the leading member of the 38-officer revolutionary council that underpins the junta. He is a strong-minded but colorless figure, however, who rarely gives interviews, makes few speeches and utterly fails to project an image.

The junta's hold on the public imagination is all the weaker in that the one figure who does show himself, Brig. Stylianos Patakos, is an alternately good-humored and irascible eccentric, whose frequent and wide-ranging pronouncements obviously have little to do with the more serious purpose—whatever that may be—of the powerful figures in the council.

The second question is also unanswered. There have been some constructive measures—elimination of a wheat subsidy, reform of the church—but mostly the program remains vague, apart from continual talk of putting down Communists and purifying Greece.

If the answer to the third question were that the junta intended to remain briefly, the first two questions would not matter much. The junta has promised to disappear as soon as conditions are ripe for what they term a "true" democracy in Greece. They have gone so far as to promise that the people will be allowed to vote on a constitution next year.

LONG-TERM GOAL

But most observers here are beginning to conclude that talk of a constitution, or indeed of any meaningful democratization, may be only empty talk, despite the military Government's announcement yesterday that it had released former Premier Georges Papandreou and eight other members of the suspended Center Union party from house arrest. The observers believe, instead, that the hard core of the revolutionary council, led by Colonel Papadopoulos, intends to set up a long-term Government of national purification, without interference either from the parties or the King.

King Constantine accepted the junta in the first place on the understanding that it would provide a quick transition back to parliamentary life. With Colonel Papadopoulos giving every sign that this is not his intention, a confrontation has been created in which the King must openly resist or let his remaining power be sapped.

SOME SUPPORT

The King has the support of many army officers and their units. But only the most carefully planned and quickly executed kind of royal counter-coup could have any chance, and the King is relatively isolated and has no real staff to allow him to organize such a venture.

On the other hand, the longer he waits the weaker his position becomes. The junta has given him a list of 400 officers for retirement, most of whom have strong royalist loyalties. He has refused to sign it so far, and the junta is believed to be modifying it. The point is that the junta, by maneuver and patience, can whittle the King's power down to the point where the last real obstacle to a long-term dictatorship is made insignificant.

October 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 4997

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1967]
MOVES BY GREECE DELAY U.S. ARMS—PLAN TO
RESUME SHIPMENTS UNDERCUT BY ARRESTS

(By Peter Grose)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—New arrests of opposition figures by the Greek military regime are having the effect of undercutting efforts by the Johnson Administration to resume shipments of large-scale military aid to Greece.

The Administration wants to resume aid shipments because President Johnson's top advisers judge that Greece's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization requires continued support.

Nevertheless, the State Department expressed annoyance today that the outspoken Athens newspaper publisher, Mrs. Helen Vlachos, was placed under house arrest yesterday. Since the military coup of April 21, the United States has publicly chided the ruling junta about 20 times.

Yet United States officials believe that except for notorious individual blunders, the new regime shows promise of moving toward what they describe as "reasonably constitutional procedures."

RENEWAL RECOMMENDED

A comprehensive recommendation for resumption of the military aid, which was suspended after the coup, has been on President Johnson's desk since August. It was prepared by a senior interagency policy-making group headed by Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach.

The United States had been supplying the Greek armed forces with about \$100-million worth of military equipment a year, including tanks and jet aircraft, to help Greece meet its missions in NATO. Lesser supplies, such as small arms and ammunition, were quietly supplied throughout the summer, but the large shipments were blocked.

Momentum toward resuming the shipments late in the summer was abruptly halted by a series of what officials here called boners, such as the ban, the regime imposed on mini-skirts and its revocation of the Greek citizenship of Melina Mercouri, the actress, who had spoken out against the coup from the start.

United States officials, including the Ambassador in Athens, Phillips Talbot, urged the military leaders to avoid such eye-catching actions, which only added impetus to the more fundamental criticisms of military dictatorship voiced by the American liberal and intellectual community.

On Tuesday it became known that the civilian who had headed the Greek Government just before the coup, Panayotis Kanelopoulos, had been placed under house arrest. He had publicly denounced the military junta. A State Department spokesman Carl Barth, added another to the series of complaints the next day and said the United States "continues to hope for an early return to constitutional procedures, with traditional liberties restored."

Then yesterday, the junta put Mrs. Vlachos under house arrest. She had called the military men who ruled Greece "mediocrities."

Criticism in Congress was aroused by a three-day visit to Washington by two senior financial officers of the military regime the governor of the Bank of Greece, Dimitrios N. Galanis, and Costas Thanos, secretary general of the Ministry of Co-ordination. The two officials left Washington yesterday, after meetings at the state department and the Export-Import Bank.

A bipartisan group of 52 members of the House of Representatives signed a letter to the Administration yesterday urging against any consideration of economic aid for Greece.

A spokesman for the Export-Import Bank said there had been no discussion of economic aid during the talks there, which he described as a courtesy call. The State Department spokesmen said the Greek officials made no formal request for aid during their meeting with Assistant Secretary of State

Anthony M. Solomon, and that there had been no change in the administration's embargo of large military shipments.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1967]
GREEK JUNTA DEFENDED

ATHENS, October 5.—A prominent member of the National Radical Union party took public issue today with the recent attack made on the Greek military junta by the party's leader, Former Premier Panayotis Kanelopoulos.

In an article published today in the Government-controlled Athens newspaper Vradyni, Panayotis Pipinellis said that the April coup was "necessary and unavoidable." He called on Greeks to support the junta, though he expressed reservations about some of its acts.

The article was distributed in English by the junta's press officials.

The extent to which Mr. Pipinellis's statement would split his party could not be determined, but its timing was a decided blow to the already-weakened opposition groups here and a considerable victory for the junta.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 10, 1967]

THE RIGHT DIRECTION

It would be churlish not to welcome the Greek Government's release of former Premier George Papandreou from house arrest, and the lifting of restrictions on the movements of eight of his colleagues in the outlawed Center Union Party. But one gesture in the right direction doesn't make a representative government out of a strong-arm military junta, or a democracy out of a police state.

There are plenty of ways the present military regime, which seized power in a coup almost six months ago, can demonstrate in what direction it really intends to move. For one thing, there is the question of whether the political leaders now at large will be able to practice politics. Mr. Papandreou's release comes hard on the heels of quite a different gesture—the house arrest a week ago of another former Premier, Panayotis Kanelopoulos, and of a leading publisher, Helen Vlachou, who had both dared to speak out against the Junta and its policies. That is hardly the behavior of a government prepared to let its opposition speak.

There is also the question of the fate of Mr. Papandreou's son, Andreas, who remains in prison awaiting trial for "treason." There are at least 2500 other political prisoners still in custody, by most accounts. Finally, there has been precious little evidence of progress back toward elections and constitutional rule and the restoration of elemental rights.

The United States and the rest of the international community should make it clear that its distaste for the present regime will not be diminished by just one gesture, however welcome. It remains to be seen whether this was a sop to Greek and world opinion or the bare beginnings of real progress in the right direction.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED
AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL
IMPLEMENT WORKERS
OF AMERICA—UAW,

Washington, D.C., October 5, 1967.

Hon. DON EDWARDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: I write to ask that your influence be exerted to the full toward preventing either extension or restoration of U.S. aid in any form to Greece while that country remains in the grip of an essentially fascist military junta.

The Pattakos clique, using military equipment largely of U.S. origin, has throttled Greek democracy, jailed thousands of the most respected men and women in public life, imposed military censorship on all forms

of utterance, reduced Greek labor unions to creatures of a Nazi-like labor front, and rules through unrelieved terror and oppression. Continued association by our country with such a regime—to say nothing of outright economic or military assistance to it—can only compromise, grievously, our country's own integrity.

I write not alone in behalf of the 1,500,000 members of the UAW, an organization which has for many years worked closely with once-free Greek unions in support of the democratic modernization of that nation. Every element of Greek life, including the most conservative of its traditional democratic participants, has had violent hands laid upon it by the military junta. The depth of world reaction to the dictatorship's assault upon the very fundaments of a free national community may be judged from the decision of the Common Market's Executive Commission to terminate Common Market assistance to Greece. I submit that our nation can do no less than to curtail economic or military assistance of any kind to Greece until such time as civil freedoms there have been restored. Not to do so is to invite authoritarian forces in any nation presently the beneficiary of American assistance to conclude that they can destroy freedom with impunity. Not to do so is to turn our backs on the thousands of courageous Greek citizens who have risked assassination and concentration camps by protesting the dictatorship's destruction of the democratic institutions which are that nation's priceless gift to the world.

Very sincerely yours,

VICTOR G. REUTHER,

Director,

International Affairs Department.

Americanism: The Ideal and the Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Miss Trudy Ouliber, from Perrine, Fla., has recently been named winner of the Florida State Federation of Women's Clubs Americanism essay contest with her essay, "The Ideal and the Reality." Trudy was only 15, and in the ninth grade at Cutler Ridge Junior High School when she wrote her essay, and the Perrine Women's Club submitted it to the State federation contest.

Trudy's essay exhibits exceptional maturity and insight, unusual for such a young student, and I wish to join the Perrine Women's Club in commending her for her outstanding achievement.

AMERICANISM: THE IDEAL AND THE REALITY

Americanism cannot be fully understood without first understanding America, and who can understand a dream?

For a dream such a country was, long before the Pilgrims set foot on her shores. Men longed for freedom, freedom of worship, to work as his talents led, freedom to voice his opinion, to own that which his hands had earned, and all the other freedoms which gave him personal dignity, self respect, and worth in the eyes of his fellow man. Out of these longings America was born, and Americanism came into being.

Is Americanism just the spirit of loyalty to American ideals, or is it a study in contradiction? Our constitution proclaims that all men are created free and equal, yet, what of the yellowed receipt that reads: "Re-

A 4998

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 10, 1967

ceived, \$500 for the purchase of one male slave?"

As the geography of our country sweeps from snow capped mountains to sandy beaches, her economy from industrial millionaires to poverty stricken share croppers, her society from ultra-conservative Chicago to riot ridden Berkeley, her politics from far Right to rosy Left, so do the varied meanings of Americanism appear the Ideal and the Reality.

Because the world has yet to see the fulfillment of the American ideal, there are those who say it is a failure. Nothing could be further from the truth. America is still marching toward maturity and the attainment of the dream.

Patriotism is a vital part of Americanism. While one young man burns his draft card or flees to Canada to escape induction, another applies for entrance into Officers Training School, and still another asks for reenlistment papers at the end of his tour of duty.

At sporting events, one man may chat with his neighbor during the singing of the national anthem as another stands silent, erect, and proud of his American heritage.

All of these reactions are aspects of Americanism. For all are Americans and each reveals by his feelings for his country—one the Ideal, the other the Reality, and each a part of the whole.

As America moves across the stage of history, it would be wise for the people to pause and look again toward the splendor of the Ideal; to realize that it cannot be casually taken as a gift from their forefathers, but must be won by personal effort and even sacrifice.

Americans must never forget this vital truth, as expressed in the slogan of the Freedom Train: "Freedom is everybodys job."

We have seen the effect of Americanism in the past; we know its power in the present; but with these realities what does it hold for the future?

Resolution Concerning Firearms Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at their annual convention at Toronto, Ontario, Canada, in opposition to S. 1 and H.R. 5384 to restrict the right of law-abiding citizens to acquire firearms.

This resolution opposing that outrageous legislation sets forth the unanimous views of all of our game, fish, and conservation commissioners, and speaks the thoughts of all law-abiding sportsmen, sportsmen's groups, and conservationists on the subject of this weak and unworkable legislation so incorrectly merchandised as a panacea for our crime problems in this Nation.

RESOLUTION 1—FIREARMS CONTROL LEGISLATION

Whereas, restrictive firearms legislation proposed in the 90th Congress as S. 1 (as amended) or H.R. 5384 conflict with the Sec-

ond Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which constitutes the American citizen's right to keep and bear arms, and

Whereas, any unreasonable restriction on firearms would tend to reduce the amount of hunting enjoyed by the American people, one of the basic freedoms traditional to the growth and development of this great country; and

Whereas, a reduction in the sport of hunting would impair the economic welfare of the United States, where the pursuit of wild game represents a thriving industry; and

Whereas, this proposed legislation on gun control would only restrict, unnecessarily, law-abiding American citizens, leaving the criminal free to steal or smuggle firearms at will, since criminals do not abide by any laws, let alone firearms control; and

Whereas, the sportsmen of the United States, representing a large portion of the population, have repeatedly expressed their disapproval of firearms control legislation; and

Whereas, legislation should hit hard on the unlawful use of firearms rather than at the right of ownership:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, does hereby express opposition to the legislation proposing restrictions on firearms as submitted by Senator Thomas J. Dodd and Representative Emanuel Celler in the first session of the 90th Congress in S.B. 1 (as amended) and H.R. 5384; and

Be it further resolved, that the Association supports the principles contained in S. 1853 and S. 1854 as introduced by Senator Roman L. Hruska which would provide reasonable controls over handguns and heavy military weapons used by criminals, incompetents and drug addicts and would have the least effect on sporting firearms.

Congratulations to Bronx Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in announcing to the House that the Bronx Post Office in my county of the Bronx, N.Y., has received the 1967 National Post Office Award of the Magazine Publishers Association.

This recognition of excellence and efficiency in postal administration was presented in the form of a bronze plaque to Postmaster Frank J. Viola, of the Bronx, at the national convention of the National Association of Postmasters. I commend Postmaster Viola and other officials and employees of the Bronx Post Office for the splendid services rendered to the people of the Bronx.

With permission, I insert an article from the New York Times of October 8, 1967:

BRONX POST OFFICE RECEIVES A PLAQUE AS
BEST IN NATION

SAN JUAN, P.R., October 7.—The Bronx Post Office won a bronze plaque here today for being the best in the nation.

The 1967 National Post Office Award was presented by the Magazine Publishers Association at the annual convention of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States.

Charles D. Ablard of Washington, the magazine publishers' vice president, handed the 24-by-19-inch plaque to Frank J. Viola, the Bronx postmaster.

The citation singled out the Bronx Post Office for "excellence and efficiency in postal administration and employees." In making the award, Mr. Ablard said:

"With the dedicated talent and leadership of the postmaster, the supervisors and the employees, the Bronx Post Office has shown conclusively that the task of processing and delivering the mail can be accomplished despite the complexities and adversities of all the inherited problems of an urban environment."

The publishers' announcement of the award said that the Bronx Post Office had reduced work hours and overtime despite an increased volume of mail and had speeded mail deliveries at no additional cost, while maintaining good employee-management relations.

The office serves 1.5 million persons in 44 square miles of the borough. It has 3,700 employees and its receipts are \$15-million a year.

American Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent and pointed definitions of American patriotism that I have seen will appear tomorrow in the Post Eagle, of Clifton, N.J., in a column entitled "Outlook and Insight" by Eugene T. Bartkowiak. He focuses on the deeds of two great patriots, Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to those two great Poles who helped found this Nation, and as a continuing tribute to the great Polish-American community of today and tomorrow, I include Mr. Bartkowiak's article, entitled "American Patriotism," in today's RECORD:

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

(By Eugene T. Bartkowiak)

Over 190 years ago, men like Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko joined forces with other famous American patriots such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and John Adams; and with pen and sword they brought a new nation, The United States of America, into being. It was an exciting time, a time for moving ahead and boldly facing new dangers. It was the time when American patriotism was molded.

Casimir Pulaski came to America and in the army of George Washington served at Brandywine. He was made General and Chief of Cavalry by Congress and fought for the greatness of America at Germantown and in the winter campaign of 1777-78. In 1779, as Brigadier General, he defended Charleston. Wounded at Savannah, General Pulaski died for America aboard ship en route back to Charleston.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko entered the American continental army as a volunteer and he too brilliantly distinguished himself in the Revolutionary War. For fortifying Philadelphia he obtained the rank of Colonel of Engineers; and his services at Miconderoga in 1777 contributed to the defeat of General John Burgoyne at Saratoga. He planned and built the fortress of West Point and was Chief Engineer of the Southern army. He took part in the sieges of Ninety-Six and of Charleston and was rewarded with the thanks of Congress,

propaganda machine with all the gist it needs.

Under the circumstances, it's a miracle the South Vietnamese are doing as well as they are.

After 20 years of war and internal subversion this exhausted uneducated, struggling country is now being rapped because its army is not as efficient as the U.S. Army.

Admittedly the South Vietnamese lack the strength, skill and tenacity of U.S. divisions. But our divisions represent the cream of the world's best professional army and the cream of the world's best educated youngsters.

Conservative figures published recently show that since 1960 South Vietnamese lost at least 50,000 soldiers killed. If the respective populations are considered, this would represent 600,000 Americans. (The U.S. has 12 times the population of South Vietnam).

The United States didn't lose that many men in World War I, World War II and Korea combined.

The Viet Cong has assassinated 12,000 civilians, kidnapped 42,000 other.

Before we become too critical of South Vietnamese faults, let's ask ourselves:

How many of us would go to vote knowing we might be killed in the process?

Some 83-85 per cent of the South Vietnamese electorate cast their votes in defiance of all Viet Cong intimidation and threats.

How many of us would accept an official capacity in small towns and villages visited by marauding murderers? How many of us would support the government knowing we risked being kidnapped, tortured, killed—or were exposing our families to the same fate? South Vietnamese do.

Let's stop being pompous, smug and self-righteous. Let's give South Vietnam its due.

We are fighting their war, but they are fighting our war too.

Let's not forget it.

NE file
The "Palestine Liberation Organization"
Office in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the founding of the State of Israel, Arab terrorists have launched almost continuous attacks against its people. In 1964 the Arab States aided in the formation of a formal terrorist group known as the "Palestine Liberation Organization."

Since that time the PLO has been training terrorists in the refugee camps of the Gaza strip for service as guerrilla fighters against Israel. One of the most disgraceful aspects of this situation has been the fact that UNRWA funds, which were supposed to be for the benefit of the refugees, have been channeled into the training of these military units.

The PLO maintains an office in New York City and in the following article from the September 7, 1967, edition of the American Examiner the question is quite properly asked: Should we permit this group—which is committed to the

destruction of a country with which the United States maintains friendly relations—to operate in our country?

The article follows:

WHY DOES SHUKAIRY'S SO-CALLED PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION CONTINUE TO HAVE AN OFFICE IN NEW YORK?

(By James H. Sheldon)

The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) is the parent body of the illegal Palestine Liberation Army. Three months after the Arab-Israel War, it still maintains an office in New York City.

PLO was formed, openly and brazenly, for the purpose of liquidating the State of Israel ("Liberating Palestine," to use PLO terminology, since its officers do not admit the legal existence of Israel). In its "National Charter," as filed with the Foreign Agents Registration Section of the Department of Justice, PLO declares its purpose to be the "liberation of Palestine," denounces the United Nations partition resolution and the establishment of Israel as "illegal and void," and resolves to "outlaw" Zionism in the Middle East.

Prior to last June its head, Ahmad Shukairy, was fond of closing speeches to his followers with a shouted "We shall destroy Tel-Aviv," or similar language.

Actually, PLO has attempted (with the official sponsorship of the Arab states) to set itself up as a kind of shadow government for Palestine. Art. 27 of its Charter declares: "This organization shall have its flag, oath, and a national anthem—and Art. 22 of the attached 'Fundamental Law' provides for the establishment of 'special Palestinian Military Units, formed in accordance with the military needs and the plan adopted by the Unified Arab Command.'"

We reproduce here a few items quoted from "A Summary of Events in the Middle East," issued as an official publication of Senator J. W. Fulbright's Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

"May 8, 1964.—Representatives of the Arab States met in Jerusalem and announced the creation of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

"September 1, 1964.—The Arab Foreign Ministers allocated \$2.3 million to the Palestine Liberation Organization.

"June 19, 1966.—The head of the Palestine Liberation Organization Ahmad Shukairy, said that members of the PLO army would go to Viet-Nam 'to fight alongside the Vietcong in their struggle against American imperialism.'"

"May 17, 1967.—Ahmad Shukairy, leader of the PLO, said that his organization would continue to send infiltrators into Israel. He also repeated past statements that the PLO was armed by the Chinese Communists."

To make the situation worse, PLO set out to use the Arab refugee camps of the Middle East as a training ground for organizing its infiltrators and military units. Through UNRWA, the United States pays more than 70 per cent of the cost of maintaining these centers. After a careful investigation, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D., Mass.) reported that at least 12,000 inhabitants of refugee camps were being trained, mostly in the Gaza Strip, for service as guerrilla fighters under Shukairy's leadership.

It is appropriate to ask the question now: Why does PLO—whose only purpose is to destroy Israel—continue to exist, and even to maintain offices in New York, three months after a cease-fire was supposedly agreed upon and accepted by all parties?

It is not possible to argue that PLO has shown any change of policies since the events of June. On July 17, indeed, Radio Cairo broadcasted a report of a meeting of the PLO Executive Committee, held that very day, for

the purpose of preparing for "the next stage" of the war against Israel. The intent to "liberate" Palestine was again declared, as "a part of the world's liberation battles." The National Charter of PLO, with its provisions for a "Liberation Army," was reaffirmed. The scope of the "battle" was even widened, in a declaration that "It has become clear that the danger of Zionism and imperialism, headed by the United States, is no longer limited to Palestine." Israel's defense actions were called "imperialist Zionist aggression."

Implicit in the whole program of PLO is a continuing close solidarity with the communist governments of the world, and particularly with the Red Chinese regime in Peking. Readers of this column will recall that we exposed, more than a year ago, the establishment of a Peking office of PLO, headed by Rashid Sayyid Jarbu, who had been granted a regular block of time on Peking radio for the purpose of propagandizing his cause in Asia. Subsequently, the Peking government supplied PLO guerrilla groups with shipments of bazookas and other weapons. On June 6, 1967, just after fighting commenced in the Middle East, Premier Chou En Lai addressed a message to Ahmad Shukairy assuring him that the Chinese Government at Peking would "ever remain the staunch and reliable comrades-in-arms" of the Arabs in the "struggle to repel the aggression by United States imperialism and its tool Israel."

The propaganda of PLO in America, however, has said very little about the guerrilla activities which are the center of its existence. On the contrary, the New York office talks about the "suffering" of Arab refugees, and the "injustice" of Israel's existence. The New York PLO organ, Palestine Issue, currently complains of what it calls "The Crime of the Christian West in the Holy Land."

When Israel sought to defend herself against Nasser's troops poised for a death-strike, her action was described as an "unholy Jewish invasion," made possible because "the Christians of the West have been the defenders of the 'State of Israel' against the innocent indigenous Arab inhabitants." At this point, the PLO editor waxes turbulent, and we read:

"Woe to thee, Christians of the West, for ye have sold the Land of Peace to fanatic Zionists for 'Thirty pieces of silver.'"

Another article in the same publication, charging that the Israelis refused to cooperate with the Red Cross, is completely at variance with reputable news agency reports from the war zone.

When it comes to talks with Arab students in America, however, PLO representatives take a very different line. Addressing a convention of the Arab Students Organization in the U.S.A. a New York representative of PLO, Saadat Hasan, spelled out the advantages of guerrilla fighting against a modernized army and called upon the students to give their support to PLO. Officers of the Association backed him up in this propaganda.

In short, there continues to exist today, in New York, an office of an organization which is devoted to waging war against a country with which the United States maintains friendly relations. Unlike the mission of a sovereign state, PLO is not an agency to which we grant diplomatic status. It is subject to our laws, which regulate the activities of all foreign agents. Besides propaganda in this country, it attempts to influence delegates at the United Nations, in spite of the U.N. cease-fire actions. What the U.N. delegates do about this is their concern—but whether PLO should be allowed to continue its political activities in our own country, and to insult our citizens, is another matter. The Justice Department should give the whole situation an early and very serious review.

October 10, 1967

A 5002

Salute to Betts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Representative JACKSON E. BETTS, was the only witness to protest against the nature of the upcoming 1970 census in hearings before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in May and June of this year. In seeking to preserve the privacy of the individual against unwarranted intrusion he has introduced legislation, H.R. 10952, limiting the categories of questions required, to be answered under penalty of law. Because I believe the American citizen has a right to his privacy and the right to be left alone and because the Constitution states the purpose of the census shall be that of enumeration I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his stand and have, as a consequence, joined him in introducing such legislation.

Just this morning, the Wall Street Journal in an editorial entitled "Big Brother 1970 Model," saluted Representative BETTS' stand and warned its readers of the rude shock in store for them when the 1970 census comes around unless changes are made. The editorial, in its entirety, follows:

BIG BROTHER, 1970 MODEL

Unless Rep. Jackson Betts and a few other like-minded Congressmen have their way, Americans are in for a rude shock when the 1970 census comes around. For as plans now stand, the forms to be provided by the Bureau of the Census are about as long and certainly are as inquisitive as those devised by the Internal Revenue Service.

Rep. Betts regards the more than 60 items the Census Bureau plans to ask people about as harassment and an invasion of personal privacy. The Ohioan suggests that questions on which answers are mandatory be limited to matters considered as essential to a census, such as name and address, sex, age, race and marital status. Answers to questions about such things as plumbing fixtures, he says, ought to be voluntary.

Certainly if the special trial census prepared earlier this year for New Haven, Conn., foreshadows what is to come in 1970, Rep. Betts has a point. For it not only seeks the sort of data needed for a count of the population, but probes far beyond.

It asks, for instance, "How do you enter your living quarters?" "Do you have a complete bathroom?" And if you do, how many people do you share it with? It asks if heat, light, off-street parking and use of a swimming pool are included in your rent, if you are a tenant. It asks about your water supply, what fuel you use most for heating, whether or not you have a garbage disposal unit, dishwasher and television set (black and white, or color?).

Now it is plain that many of these questions are designed for later use by private industry, educational institutions and governmental agencies. But surely it is possible to get answers to those which are irrelevant to the essential business of a census by means other than threatening the respondent with 60 days in jail and a \$100 fine, the penalty for noncompliance.

In 1960, about five million persons somehow managed to escape the Census Bureau's notice. And unless the proposed 1970 form is pared to essentials, after one look at it a good many more millions are likely to long for the same sort of limbo.

Alleged Postal Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of Members of the House to an article in the October 16, 1967, issue of Newsweek in which the columnist, Raymond Moley, takes a long, hard look at the pending postal rate increase bill.

Mr. Moley properly asks why this bill is being rushed through Congress rather than await the report of a "blue ribbon" committee to which was delegated the task of ascertaining what is wrong with the operation of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Moley's article follows:

THOSE ALLEGED POSTAL SUBSIDIES

(By Raymond Moley)

A House bill to raise postal rates and increase the pay of postal employees (H.R. 7977) has been passed by the Post Office Committee and cleared for floor action by the Rules Committee. This bill is a hybrid. Originally there were two bills—one to comply with the President's demand for higher postal rates and the other to raise the pay of postal employees. The latter, however, gave employees a raise higher than the President's guidelines for Federal employees. And so, to avoid a veto of the pay bill, the House committee combined the two into one piece of legislation. Thus, the present bill is a product of a political maneuver, a practice which from time immemorial has characterized almost everything related to the postal service.

Moreover, this bill is being rushed through despite the fact that a commission of distinguished people was appointed by the President to study the postal service and will not report until next year. The chairman of that commission is Frederick R. Kappel, former chairman of AT&T. The commission was no doubt appointed at the instance of Postmaster General O'Brien, who declared that the "archaic" postal service is "ponderous, creaking, erratic, costly."

THE BURDEN UPON USERS

Instead of waiting for the Kappel commission's report, which may well show how the Post Office can be reformed to the extent that most of the postal deficit can be eliminated, the House Post Office Committee chose to increase the present scale of rates and thus throw the burden upon the users of the mail service.

My argument here deals with what is called a "subsidy" for users of second- and third-class mail. According to the figures in the House committee report, first-class mail in 1966 showed a surplus of \$67.7 million. But second- and third-class mail provided deficits of \$416.2 million and \$401.2 million respectively. For a long time figures like these have been used to claim that users of second- and third-class mail have enjoyed a huge Federal subsidy.

I have had reason to feel the effect of this claim, for whenever over the past twenty

years I have in my pieces in this magazine commented upon subsidies in government agencies and programs. I have received letters taunting me about the "subsidy" enjoyed by periodicals. Until now, I have not replied to those charges in print. But since responsible journalists have now accepted the Post Office figures and have joined the chorus, I chose to show how deceptive those figures are. For I have always believed that these claimed subsidies have been based upon a wholly unsound system of allocating costs in the postal system.

BAD ACCOUNTING

The report of the House committee itself in its labored explanation of what are called "cost ascertainment" figures comes close to admitting their unreliability. The cost system does not, it admits, take account of the importance of the priority given to first-class mail as compared with the deferment imposed upon other classes of mail. Delivery of first-class mail is intended to be prompt and almost immediate. Second class should take two or three days, and third class about eight days. Calculations based on the sale of stamps or use of meters cannot be segregated by classes. They are used for all kinds of mail. And the whole basis of assigning costs to the three classes is based upon random samples. The minority report on the bill said: "The full committee had no opportunity whatever to study the cost ascertainment figures on which the rate increases are based . . . all rate adjustments are suspects because they are based on questionable and dubious statistics."

I have become so accustomed to government accounting in other fields that I have grown even more suspicious of the Post Office figures. In the benefit-cost ratio in some big water projects such as dams and water supply, the assumptions are ludicrous. In the Department of HEW there are twelve accounting systems, and none of these has been approved by the Comptroller General's office.

Common sense should tell anyone that since the same men and women, the same buildings, mail trucks, trains, boats and even in some cases horses and mules are used for all classes of mail in varying volume, an allocation of respective class costs is substantially impossible.

In the postal service, 80 per cent of the costs are for labor, and labor is largely used in handling, carrying and sorting mail. Under the ZIP Code system, magazines must do much of this handling at their own expense. A first-class item is handled on the average fifteen times by postal employees. Magazines do nine of those handlings at their own expense.

Despite this continual pushing of rising labor costs upon the users of second- and third-class mail, the rate increases on second-class (122 per cent) and third-class (188 per cent) over fifteen years have been far more than for first-class mail (67 per cent).

Finally, it should be noted that the rate increases in the present bill fall relatively most heavily upon periodicals of small circulation. To the big, the increases are an unjustified burden, but to the smalls the proposed rates are a tragic blow. And these smalls include hundreds of special periodicals—cultural, religious, scientific, professional and fraternal.

Here is the example of The Atlantic. Its publisher, Frank M. Herbert Jr., told the Post Office Committee that the present bill would add to his costs \$8,800 for first-class mail, \$26,250 for second-class mail and \$52,800 for third-class mail. In all, this is \$87,850. His average profits over five years have been \$22,795. Thus, at one blow The Atlantic would either be destroyed or go deeply into debt. And this situation might well apply to hundreds of lesser-known periodicals.